

April 2, 1992

LB 78

occurred during an abortion, after an abortion, the complications, nobody gave them the information that we're requesting now that be given to them in LB 78 and time for them to make a very important decision in their life. I urge the rejection of the Hillman amendment and the amendment definitely of Senator Bernard-Stevens. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Labeledz. Senator Bernard-Stevens, you're next.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, Senator Lindsay and I were sharing a lighter moment a few minutes ago and we both marveled on where the discussion has gone, at least far, far from the amendment that I offered and certainly far from the amendment to the amendment that Senator Hillman offered, and it's interesting because it's good to be able to have a lighter moment with John because John and I are good friends and we differ on this particular issue and that's the way it probably should be, being able to get along but yet disagree on these types of issues. Senator Labeledz talked about a lot of things but one thing she didn't talk about was the amendment that was before us, for the most part, the Bernard-Stevens amendment and the Hillman amendment she alluded to. But, for the most part, I fail to see on any of her discussions what she disagrees about the proposed amendment. I can't imagine that Senator Labeledz disagrees with Section (a) that says abortion is a serious, emotionally charged, divisive issue in the United States and in Nebraska. I think Senator Labeledz would agree with that. I can't imagine her disagreeing with Section (b) that says all Nebraskans are concerned with the physical and emotional well-being of the people in the state. Section (c) I don't think she would disagree with, a 24-hour waiting period and a requirement that a woman receive information regarding fetal development are both viable topics of debate, and I don't even think she would disagree with the Section (d) that would talk about the City of Akron v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health, the fact that that 24-hour waiting period with that particular case was ruled unconstitutional. I don't think she would disagree with that. She can't disagree with that, that's actual fact. And I can't imagine her disagreeing with the intent of the Legislature that if the Supreme Court changes the law of the land that we shouldn't come back and revisit this issue, and I can't imagine her disagreeing with the idea that the last section that says members of the Legislature on both sides of the abortion issue